

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/039,654	12/31/2001	Gregory F. Jacobs	53750US002	9214
32692 7:	590 06/23/2004		EXAM	IINER
3M INNOVA	TIVE PROPERTIES C	HARTMANN, GARY S		
PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SI. FAUL, MI	(14 JJ1JJ-J-Z1		3671	<u> </u>

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. 1		4		
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/039,654	JACOBS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Gary Hartmann	3671		
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of the eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become a	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for all	·			
closed in accordance with the practice und	aer <i>⊑x paπe Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-21</u> is/are pending in the appear 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>12-14 and 21</u> is/a 5)□ Claim(s) <u>is/are allowed.</u> 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-11 and 15-20</u> is/are rejecte 7)□ Claim(s) <u>is/are objected to.</u> 8)□ Claim(s) <u>are subject to restriction and appear to the appearance of the appearan</u>	are withdrawn from considera	ation.		
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2001 Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[the drawing(s) be held in abeya prrection is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)		•		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94: Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/18/4. 	B) Paper No	r Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 		
S. Patent and Trademark Office				

Art Unit: 3671

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (U.S. Patent 5,853,846) in view of Szekely (U.S. Patent 5,775,835). Clark et al. discloses forming an array of magnetic pavement elements (6) interconnected by a carrier web (4, 12, 21). The connection between elements (Figure 5, for example) is frangible; however, Clark et al. does not specifically teach the severing of the web around a perimeter of the elements. Szekely teaches severing around a perimeter of paving elements in order to utilize different sizes as required by the application (column 4, lines 9-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have severed around a perimeter of each of the elements of Clark et al. in order to obtain sizes suited for a particular application, as taught by Szekely.

The configurations of webs (4, 12, 21) meet the recitations of claims 2-4.

The magnetic particles (6) are distributed in a binder (4).

There is an alternating polarity.

The adhesive (8) is optionally pressure sensitive, and there is a liner (10) covering the adhesive.

Art Unit: 3671

Regarding claim 9, webs 4 and 12 are polymeric materials and web 21 is a non-woven web.

The elements are adhered to a pavement surface.

The elements are formed in a predetermined pattern.

The web meets the recitation of extensible carrier web.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner maintains that the web of Clark et al. meets the recitation of frangible. Figure 7 shows the web in the form of a roll. Clearly, the web would need to be cut if the marker was applied to the full length of roadway prior to the roll running out of the spool.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Szekely clearly teaches cutting the marker in order to fit a particular area. Both Clark et al. and Szekely are concerned with pavement markings; therefore, it would have been within ordinary skill to consider the teaching of Szekely while working with the apparatus of Clark et al.

Art Unit: 3671

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Hartmann whose telephone number is 703-305-4549. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Will can be reached on 703-308-3870. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3671

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gary Hartmann
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3671

gh